

Appl. No. 10/806,926  
Amdt. Dated September 22, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of July 22, 2005

### REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated July 22, 2005. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 21, cancelled claims 12-20 and 22 and added new dependent claims 23 and 24. In view of these amendments and remarks Applicant believes the application should be allowed.

Claim 22 was objected to under Rule 1.75 and rejected under Section 112, second paragraph. Claim 22 has been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Groenenberg Patent No. 6,277,059 ("Groenenberg"). Applicant traverses this rejection because Groenenberg fails to teach each of the elements of claims 1 and 22. Claim 1 requires an input table attached to the housing for feeding paper sheets into the housing for processing the paper sheets according to the position of the adjustment bar, a stacking table attached to the housing for receiving the processed paper sheets exiting the housing and a stacking arm attached to the housing and extending onto the stacking table, the stacking arm having a roller for assisting in stacking of the processed paper sheets exiting the housing on the stacking table. Claim 1 also requires a mechanical link connecting the stacking arm to the adjustment bar and the mechanical link providing for adjustment of the stacking arm relative to the type of fold provided by the fold plate.

Groenenberg fails to disclose each of the elements of claim 1. Groenenberg discloses rollers 42 and a stationary shaft 43 which are part of a transport roller system 33, as depicted in Fig. 4. This transport roller system 33, stationary shaft 43 and rollers 42 are not attached to the housing adjacent a stacking table and do not extend onto the stacking table. Nor do these components assist in stacking of paper sheets exiting the housing on the stacking table.

Appl. No. 10/806,926  
Amdt. Dated September 22, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of July 22, 2005

Groenenberg's collection tray 10 is the area where the sheets of the machine for Groenenberg begin their processing. As shown in Fig. 1, the collecting tray 10 is not near the delivery station 8.

In response to Applicant's arguments, the PTO stated that "the stacking table 8 of Groenenberg is further downstream for receiving the products and is positioned adjacent housing 2." (emphasis added). Thus, the PTO states that the stacking table 8 of Groenenberg is only adjacent the housing. Neither the PTO nor the Groenenberg reference disclose that the stacking arm extends onto the stacking table. The position of the stacking arm in claim 1, however, is "extending onto the stacking table." Claim 1 also requires that sheets exiting the housing on the stacking table are stacked by a roller of the stacking arm. Groenenberg fails to disclose each of these elements.

Groenenberg discloses that sheets are first received in the collection tray 10, then processed by the folding and creasing device 9, pressed flat in the creasing station 12 and "then delivered to the delivery station 8." (Col. 2, lines 50-59). Thus, Groenenberg fails to disclose that the roller 42 or stationary shaft 43 assist in stacking of processed paper sheets exiting the housing on the stacking table. In fact, Groenenberg teaches away, because the sheets are entering the machine at the roller 42. As well, neither the roller 42 nor stationary shaft 43 extend onto the stacking table, as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, there is no mechanical link depicted in Groenenberg that connects the stacking arm to the adjustment bar and the mechanical link providing for adjustment of the stacking arm relative to the type of fold provided by the fold plate as required by claim 1. In fact, Groenenberg fails to teach any mechanical links, as its means of adjusting components is

Appl. No. 10/806,926  
Amdt. Dated September 22, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of July 22, 2005

via motors (Col. 3, line 51) and electronic sensors (Col. 5, line 41). Therefore, Groenenberg fails to disclose each of the elements of claim 1 and therefore the rejection under §102 is improper and Applicant respectfully requests that it be withdrawn.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Groenenberg. Claim 11 depends from claim 1 and includes all the limitations thereof. As discussed above, claim 1 is not anticipated by Groenenberg. As well, Groenenberg fails to suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art all the elements of claim 1. Therefore, for all the reasons discussed above for claim 1; claim 11 is also allowable over Groenenberg.

Claim 22 was objected to for the above reasons but was stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has amended claim 21 by adding the limitations of claim 22. Applicant has added new claims 23 and 24 that depend from 22. Therefore claims 21, 23 and 24 are now allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-11, 21, 23 and 24 be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

David L. Newman  
Seyfarth Shaw  
Attorneys for Assignee  
55 East Monroe Street  
Suite 4200  
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803  
312-346-8000

By 